

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION**

UMG RECORDINGS, INC., et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	No. 1:17-cv-00365-DAE
GRANDE COMMUNICATIONS	)	
NETWORKS LLC,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**DEFENDANT GRANDE COMMUNICATIONS NETWORKS LLC’S RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT**

Plaintiffs UMG Recordings, Inc., et al. (“Plaintiffs”) filed a motion for entry of judgment (ECF No. 460), in accordance with the jury’s November 3, 2022 verdict (ECF No. 458). Plaintiffs’ proposed judgment is attached to their motion (ECF No. 460-1).

Defendant Grande Communications Networks LLC (“Defendant”) disagrees with Plaintiffs’ proposed form of judgment. There is no need for a complex judgment that attempts to restate and characterize the jury’s findings, which speak for themselves.<sup>1</sup> Instead, the Court should enter a simple and straightforward judgment in the form attached as Exhibit A, which mirrors the judgments entered in the similar *Sony v. Cox* litigation (Exhibit B) and *BMG v. Cox* litigation (Exhibit C).

There are two additional issues with Plaintiffs’ proposed judgment that are worth noting.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, the jury found contributory infringement of 1,403 “copyrighted works,” but Plaintiffs’ proposed judgment refers to infringement of 1,403 “copyrighted sound recordings.” Is there a difference? These kinds of issues can be avoided entirely by not attempting to characterize the verdict.

First, paragraph 2 of Plaintiffs' proposed judgment seeks to bypass the automatic 30-day of execution under Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(a). Plaintiffs have provided no reason—and there is no reason—to deviate from the default 30-day stay of execution on a judgment. Second, paragraphs 3 and 4 of Plaintiffs' proposed judgment are unnecessary and may only cause confusion. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and applicable case law govern how and whether Plaintiffs may seek attorneys' fees and prejudgment interest (addressed in paragraph 3), and the extent to which the judgment is "final" for purposes of appeal (addressed in paragraph 4).

Accordingly, Defendant respectfully requests that the Court enter the proposed judgment attached as Exhibit A. Entry of judgment will then trigger the parties' respective deadlines for post-trial motions, including motions for judgment under Rule 50(b), for attorneys' fees under Rule 54, to alter or amend the judgment under Rule 59, for a new trial under Rule 59, and for relief from the judgment under Rule 60.

Dated: December 16, 2022

By: /s/ Richard L. Brophy  
Richard L. Brophy  
Zachary C. Howenstine  
Mark A. Thomas  
Margaret R. Szewczyk  
Sydney K. Johnson  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
7700 Forsyth Blvd., Suite 1800  
St. Louis, Missouri 63105  
Telephone: 314.621.5070  
Fax: 314.621.5065  
rbrophy@atllp.com  
zhowenstine@atllp.com  
mszewczyk@atllp.com  
mathomas@atllp.com  
skjohnson@atllp.com

J. Stephen Ravel  
Texas State Bar No. 16584975  
Diana L. Nichols  
Texas State Bar No. 00784682  
KELLY HART & HALLMAN LLP  
303 Colorado, Suite 2000  
Austin, Texas 78701  
Telephone: 512.495.6429  
Fax: 512.495.6401  
Email: [steve.ravel@kellyhart.com](mailto:steve.ravel@kellyhart.com)  
[diana.nichols@kellyhart.com](mailto:diana.nichols@kellyhart.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant Grande  
Communications Networks LLC*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that on December 16, 2022, all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system pursuant to Local Rule CV-5(b)(1).

/s/ Richard L. Brophy  
Richard L. Brophy